(143)

HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE CHHATTISGARH: BILASPUR

SINGLE BENCH : HON'BLE SHRI S.R. NAYAK, CJ

W.P.No.1586 of 2005

PETITIONER Vijay Kumar Kedia, son of Late Shri Lakshman Prasad Kedia, aged about 34 years, resident of Pendra Road, District Bilaspur (C.G.)

VERSUS

RESPONDENTS

1. Chhattisgarh State Civil Supplies Corporation Ltd., through the Managing Director, Raipur.
2. The District Manager, Chhattisgarh State Civil Supplies Corporation Ltd.; Bilaspur
3. Juber Ahmed, son of Shri Atique Ahmed, aged about 44 years, resident about 44 years, resident of Pendra Road, District Bilaspur.
4. Sudhir Sahu, resident of Pendra Road, District Bilaspur.

W.P.No.2218 of 2005

PETITIONER Hariram Agrawal S/o Satyanarayan Agrawal, Aged about 65 years, Occupation- Business/Transporter, R/o Chhal Road, Gharghoda, District Raigarh (C.G.)

VERSUS

RESPONDENTS

1. State of Chhattisgarh,
   Through : Principal, Secretary,
   Civil & Food Supplies, Department,
   D.K.S. Bhawan, Raipur (C.G.)
2. Chhattisgarh Civil Supplies,
   Corporation,
   Through : Managing Director,
   Bal Ashram Parisar, Katchari Chowk
   Raipur (C.G.)
3. District Chhattisgarh Civil Supplies,
   Corporation,
   Through : Manager, Civil Supplies
   Office, District Raigarh (C.G.)
4. Safi Mohammad S/o Not known,
   Occupation – Transporter, R/o
   Ambikapur, District Surguja (C..G.)
5. Ramesh Agrawal S/o now known,

144

Occupation – Transporter, R/o Kharsia, District Raigarh (C.G.)

6. Chandrabhan Agrawal S/o Not known Occupation – Transporter, R/o. Village – Lailunga, Tahsil – Gharghoda, District Raigarh (C.G.)

Present: Shri Shailendra Shukla, learned counsel for the petitioner (W.P. No. 1586 of 2005).
Shri Amit Sharma, learned counsel for the petitioner (W.P. No. 2218 of 2005)
Shri Kishor Bhaduri, learned counsel for the respondents No. 3 & 4 (W.P.No. 1586/2005).
Shri Prateek Sharma, learned counsel for the respondent No. 4 (W.P. No. 2218 of 2005).
Shri V.R. Tiwari, learned counsel for respondents/Civil Supplies.
Shri Yashwant Singh, learned G. A. for the State.

ORAL ORDER
(Passed on 21st June, 2006)

In these writ petitions, the complaint of the petitioners is that though the bid offered by them was the lowest, contract was not awarded to them. These writ petitions have become infructuous. The term of the contract itself expired on 31-03-2006. At this distance of time, no effective relief could be granted to the petitioners. Moreover, it is not the law that the lowest bidders should always prefer in the matter of awarding contracts. Such a right in the petitioners cannot be culled out from the tender documents. These writ petitions are, therefore, dismissed. No costs.

Sd/-
Chief Justice

Kamde